

From: Rochlin, Kevin
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2014 12:01 AM
To: Douglas.Tanner@deq.idaho.gov; Greutert, Ed [USA]; Kelly Wright; Scott Miller - Idaho DEQ (Scott.Miller@deq.idaho.gov); Stifelman, Marc; susanh@ida.net; Zavala, Bernie
Subject: Comments on the Gamma Study Report
Attachments: EPA Gamma Report Comments January 29.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

See attached.

Kevin

From:

Kevin Rochlin | Superfund Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 10
Office of Environmental Cleanup
1200 6th Avenue, Suite 900, ELC-111 | Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 553-2106
(206) 553-0124 (fax)
rochlin.kevin@epa.gov



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10**

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

OFFICE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

January 29, 2014

Reply to
Attn. of ECL-111

Ms. Barbara Ritchie
FMC Corporation
1735 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

**RE: Unilateral Administrative Order for Remedial Design and Remedial Action
EPA Docket No. CERCLA 10-2013-0116**

**Review comments, FMC OU Remedial Design, Remedial Design Gamma Cap Performance
Evaluation Report Dated November 2013**

Dear Ms. Ritchie:

EPA has reviewed the referenced document. Comments are enclosed. Prior to addressing the comments, we should have a conference call to discuss them.

Sincerely,

Kevin Rochlin,
Project Manager

Enclosure

Technical Review Comments on the FMC OU Remedial Design Gamma Cap Performance Evaluation Report Dated November 2013

General Comments:

1. The Gamma Cap Performance Evaluation Report revealed two key issues that need to be resolved prior to remedy implementation.
 - a. Cap thickness necessary to meet remedial action objectives for the site has not been successfully demonstrated. Results from the Gamma Cap Model Report indicated that 12 inches of cover should be sufficient to meet RAOs if a slag concentration of 30 pCi/g Ra-226 is assumed. During the gamma cap test, it was not possible to verify this conclusion under field conditions. It is not clear at this point whether 12 inches for a gamma cap is adequate at this site.
 - b. The type of instrumentation used in the gamma cap tests does not appear to be appropriate for application to final status survey measurements at this site. Shine, possibly from other onsite sources or offsite sources, interfered with the measurements during the gamma cap tests. This made it impossible to distinguish the levels of radiation corresponding to risk-based cleanup levels with the types of instruments used. Measurement systems that avoid the effects of shine are needed.

To address these problems, follow-up tests must be performed.

To address the instrumentation issue:

- Instrumentation to be used for the final status survey must be demonstrated to have sufficient sensitivity to determine that radiation from slag has been reduced to acceptable levels.
- The instruments and methods used must be able to make this demonstration in the presence of background levels appropriate for the instrument and the site.
- The instruments used must also be able to make these determinations in spite of extraneous shine from other sources either onsite or offsite.
- Calibration and background determination for the instrumentation, as it is to be used, must be performed.
- Statistical methods for data analysis, and precision of instrumentation, must be adequate to demonstrate compliance with an acceptable level of confidence.

Once the instrumentation issues have been resolved, the test must use the instruments to demonstrate that:

- the thickness of cap to be used for the remedy will reduce radiation levels to acceptable levels over the range of concentrations reasonably anticipated in slag.



- this determination can be made under the conditions anticipated during final status surveys, including shine from other sources and possible variations in Ra-226 concentrations in slag.

The EPA recommends that:

- (1) Additional modeling be performed to estimate the necessary cap thickness over the range of Ra-226 concentrations which can be reasonably anticipated in slag at the site.
- (2) Instruments selected for the follow-up gamma cap testing should be shielded or collimated in such a way as to avoid interference from shine or other extraneous sources on the measurements.
- (3) The follow-up testing should sample to determine the Ra-226 concentration in the slag that is to be capped during the test and the remedial action and ensure that the concentrations are consistent with the assumptions of the Gamma Cap Model Report.
- (4) Statistical methods in MARSSIM should be consulted to determine the precision of measurements necessary to determine that RAOs for radiation have been met.

The EPA believes that tests performed following these recommendations will be able to demonstrate the methods needed to ensure the successful application of the remedy. Recent examples may be found in the literature where these methods have been successfully applied to radiological sites similar in scale and contaminants to the FMC site. Collimated sodium iodide or high purity germanium systems may offer practical applications to this site.

Specific Comments:

1. Page 1-3, 2nd paragraph

As a result of the gamma shine encountered, the 17.4 uR/hr performance standard is not appropriate for the elevated background circumstances encountered in these tests. Performance criteria for the gamma cap should be developed based on the circumstances likely to be encountered at the site, and based on the specific instruments, calibrations, and configurations to be used.

The 17.4 uR/hr performance standard used in this report represents the gamma radiation exposure level necessary to meet an excess cancer risk level under the following important assumptions: (1) background gamma radiation levels are 14.6 uR/hr, and (2) an outdoor commercial/industrial worker scenario. The site-related component of the performance standard (2.8 uR/hr) is equivalent to an outdoor commercial/industrial worker excess lifetime cancer risk of 1E-04, and is equivalent to a soil concentration of Ra-226 of 3.8 pCi/g.

2. Section 1.3

The performance standard for the gamma cap tests was not demonstrated in this report.



Because of contributions to the ambient radiation fields from shine related to other sources, the essential assumption regarding background levels did not hold during the project, and therefore the performance standard could not be demonstrated. It could not be demonstrated that the test cap configurations were sufficient to reduce radiation to acceptable risk-based levels. Further, it could not be demonstrated that the PIC instrument used had sufficient sensitivity to detect the 2.8 uR/hr (over background) required to meet the performance standard. Verification measurements should be carefully planned using MARSSIM and DQO methods.

The report offers evidence of significant variability of background on the site, as well as potential site and nonsite related influences on background. This presents significant challenges to methods for verification measurements. The most significant are selection of measurement instruments and development of survey protocols.

Since it is impractical to shield the entire site from shine, the most likely approaches to the problem of shine are: (1) develop location-specific background measurements for each measurement point or (2) perform measurement using instruments shielded to eliminate the influence of shine on the measurement. In the second case, it is important to note that shielding changes the amount of background that an instrument “sees”; background levels will need to be determined specifically for the shielding configuration and instrument used. For example if a PIC were shielded to cut out sources other than from the downward field of view, the “background” it would see would no longer be 14.6 uR/hr. It would be less. This effect is apparent from the data comparing collimated and unshielded configurations for sodium iodide measurements in the WUA (Table 3.3).

3. Page 3-5, Summary of Configuration 1

The performance standard was not demonstrated.

This section notes that in some cases radiation levels less than 17.4 uR/hr were achieved under conditions in which heavy equipment was used to shield the measurement from extraneous shine. It is not known, however, what the background would have been for this kind of configuration. The heavy equipment probably also would have reduced the normal background contribution to the measurement. Since the 17.4 uR/hr performance standard is based on an assumed background level without heavy equipment shielding, measurements less than this level in the presence of shielding do not necessarily demonstrate that the performance standard was met.

4. Page 3-6, Summary of Configuration 4

It is not clear whether the apparent net average exposure rate decrease from Configuration 3 to Configuration 4 (0.2 uR/hr from 4.8 to 4.6 uR/hr) is statistically significant.

5. Page 3-6, Summary of the Differences in Thickness and Exposure Rates Between Configurations 1 and 5

Final gamma cap thickness should consider not only the thickness necessary to meet minimum acceptable risk criteria, but also should consider operation and maintenance issues associated with the long term maintenance of the cap.

6. Section 3.2.

Correlations between the PIC and sodium iodide measurements were not supported. Any correlations between instruments should be made under similar conditions with the instruments measuring the same radiation fields.

The point that gamma cap and WUA data do not support regression correlation between sodium iodide CPM and PIC uR/hr is correct. Not only are there issues with the data coming from differing populations, but any attempt to correlate unshielded PIC measurements with collimated sodium iodide measurements would be questionable because the two instruments would not be measuring the same radiation field at any given location. The collimated sodium iodide would have a limited field of view, where the PIC would have a full view in all directions.

7. Section 4.2

The effectiveness of the cap thicknesses tested was not demonstrated.

The fact that there is no detectable difference in radiation measurement with the addition of soil to the test cap does not mean that the 14.1 inch cover was necessarily effective. As noted previously, the presence of gamma shine interfered with the demonstration that the performance standard had been met. The fact that there is no detectable difference between the cap thicknesses just means that the performance standard cannot be demonstrated at either thickness.

8. Section 4.2, page 4-2

The adequacy of the instruments used for meeting cleanup standards in these circumstances was not demonstrated.

It is clear that the unshielded PIC is not an appropriate instrument for demonstrating that gamma cap performance criteria consistent with risk-based cleanup criteria have been met in this situation where gamma shine confounds the measurements. Unshielded sodium iodide measurements would probably encounter the same difficulty. It is worth noting, however, that sodium iodide detectors are capable of measuring Radium-226 levels consistent with the risk-based Ra-226 cleanup levels for this site (MARSSIM Rev. 1, Table 6.7). It is possible, therefore, that collimated sodium iodide measurements, with lower background, could be an alternative to the PIC instruments. Instrument and site-specific background levels for these configurations would need to be developed. No correlation with PIC instruments would be needed, but provisions would have to be made to calibrate the sodium iodide instruments to Ra-226 soil concentrations. Other surveys along these lines have used calibration pads in Grand Junction, CO or sampled test areas with a range of radiation levels to establish calibrations. Another alternative would be to cross-calibrate shielded sodium iodide response with Ra-226 concentrations in soil determined using a shielded in-situ high purity germanium system.

9. Section 4.3 Recommendations

- A. As stated in the general comments, additional performance evaluations must be performed prior to remedy implementation to demonstrate the selection of the proper instrumentation, and the effectiveness of selected cap thickness.
- B. Post-remedial action monitoring plans following MARSSIM and DQO guidance should be included in the preliminary draft PSVP to be submitted as part of the Preliminary (30%) Remedial Design for the soil remedy. The surveys anticipated at FMC meet the definition of “Final Status Surveys” under MARSSIM, and should be planned, designed and carried out following that guidance. This process should be applied to the selection of survey instruments and the determination of required sensitivities and uncertainties. MARSSIM provides guidance and examples for the use of the DQO process and for the application of MARSSIM methods to final status surveys.
- C. With regard to the performance standard of 17.4 uR/hr, this criterion will need to be evaluated in the context of MARSSIM guidance. In particular, MARSSIM deals with background using a statistically-based hypothesis testing approach. MARSSIM Appendix D provides a good example of a “2-sample” (i.e. where one sample is background reference) case. In MARSSIM the difference between reference (background) and residual concentrations is based on the difference between background and residual distribution means. This differs from the Gamma Cap Study approach of adding a risk-based increment to the 95% confidence level of background. Following MARSSIM, statistical tests would be performed to determine whether the background and survey area means differ by more than the risk-based cleanup level. Examples, including a stepwise approach to statistical evaluation of gamma data can be found in the Homestake Mining Company Removal Action Report from EPA Region 6.
- D. The distribution of background data is an important issue, since wide variations in background would make evaluation of a small risk-based increment difficult. Since different instruments (PIC, sodium iodide, high purity germanium) will have different distributions in their background data measurements, the statistical needs of MARSSIM evaluations are important considerations in the selection of survey instrumentation. Correspondingly, the type of instrument selected for the final status survey, and its calibration and configuration, determine the nature of the background data needed to support decision making. Background data should be obtained that will support these needs.



References and Examples:

Multi Agency Radiation Survey and Site Investigation Manual (MARSSIM), EPA 402-R-97-016
Rev 1, August 2000.

Guidance for the Data Quality Objectives Process, EPA QA/G-4, EPA/600/R-96/055, August
2000

Removal Action Report for Homestake Mining Company, US EPA Region 6, May 2012